REMARKS

Claims 1 and 8 have been amended in order to more particularly point out, and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. The Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added. It is believed that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated **February 19, 2008.**

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:

In the Office Action, Claims 1- 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Stutzman (U.S. Patent No. 5,271,850). Reconsideration and removal of this rejection are respectfully requested in view of the present amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

It appears as though the filter unit of Stutzman is being mischaracterized in the Office Action. Referring to FIG. 3, a number of directional arrows indicate the flow of fluid through the filter unit. Also, the flow of fluid is described beginning at column 4, line 51 of the specification of Stutzman. The filter consists of a pair of filter cartridges which are similar cylindrical halves (20) separated midway of the axially longitudinal extend of the cartridge by a horizontal screen (26). The fluid to be filtered enters the top of the upper filter cartridge and the bottom of the lower filter cartridge. Fluid does not enter dense fibrous peripheral jacket (27) or impermeable inner core (4). The fluid flows vertically downward and upward within the cartridge, and the fluid joins at the horizontal screen. At the horizontal screen the fluid turns radially inward along the screen until reaching the

cartridge bore, where the flow turns vertical to flow along the outside of outflow pipe (15), which it then enters.

It is respectfully submitted that the fluid does not "fall upon" or enter the filter element (cartridge) at a cylindrical shape inner peripheral surface as in the present invention. Also, the alleged inflow chamber does not have a "structure" arranged such that fluid flows radially, as presently claimed. The alleged "structure" is the horizontal screen (26), which is not disposed in the alleged inflow chamber.

Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 8 to include that the fluid falls upon and enters the filter element at the cylindrical shape inner peripheral surface. In view of the amendments to Claims 1 and 8, and the above remarks, removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Campo (U.S. Patent No. 3,675,776). Reconsideration and removal of this rejection are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

The Office Action does not provide any details for the rejection in view of Campo. However, in view of the details in the rejection of Claim 11, discussed below, it appears as though the Office Action alleges that (22/A) corresponds to the inflow chamber, (24/B) corresponds to the outflow chamber and one of the layers of filter element (28) corresponds to the target trapping element. The Office Action refers to column 3, lines 35-60 of Campo.

Present Claim 10 refers to the mesh sizes of the "target trapping element" and the "fall-off preventing element" in relation to the size of the target foreign matter. However, Campo does not

teach or suggest any sizes for the elements of the filter in relation to the size of the target foreign matter.

Additionally, beginning at column 4, line 25, Campo teaches that the filter element (28) can be removed and reinserted in a reverse orientation so that directions of the flow would be reversed in relation to the direction of flow prior to reversing the orientation. Such teaching further supports an argument that the presently claimed arrangement is not taught by Campo, as reversing flow in the present elements would not allow the functions carried out by the present elements to occur, as it is claimed that the fall-off preventing element is provided on the side surface of the inflow path.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:

In the Office Action, Claims 7, 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stutzman in view of Budzich (U.S. Patent No. 4,687,572). Reconsideration and removal of this rejection are respectfully requested in view of the present amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

Claims 7. 9 and 12 depend from Claims 1 and 8, which are discussed above. In view of the amendments to Claims 1 and 8, and the above remarks, removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campo in view of Kuh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,681,677). Reconsideration and removal of this

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAY 14 2008

rejection are respectfully requested in view of the present claim amendments and the following remarks.

It appears as though the details in the Office Action are directed to Claim 10. The distinctions between the present invention and the device of Campo are discussed above. In view of the above remarks, removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Claims 1-12, as amended, are believed to be patentable and in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP

James N. Baker, Reg. No. 40,899

for Mel R. Quintos
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 31,898

MRQ/JNB/ak

Atty. Docket No. 040122
Suite 400
1420 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 659-2930

23850
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE